



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

I have accomplished my task, undertaken, in the first instance, for my own satisfaction, and with a view to clear up the perplexing problems presented by this group of chapters, problems which I found either passed over in silence or most inadequately treated in every English book accessible to me. This may perhaps excuse the paradox of an essay in Old Testament criticism by an amateur equally ignorant of Hebrew and German. It may be justified by some measure of success. The results reached in such a manner must be very largely provisional. It is probable that a critical survey of the whole book would in part confirm and in part serve to correct them. I have, perhaps, thrown some light on "the method of the editor of Jeremiah." It is right to say that I have not had the opportunity of consulting the article in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*. But I gather that it no longer represents the matured views of its distinguished author. I am unable to use the work of Stade, and though I have read with care the letters of Sir H. Howorth to *The Academy* on the subject of the "First Book of Esdras," yet as I am not qualified to test his conclusions, I have not ventured to adopt them. But I hope that a more careful sifting of exilic and post-exilic prophecy may throw fresh light on the history of the Return.

---

#### ADDENDA.

THE proper sequel of Jer. iii. 1-5 is to be found in verses 19, 20, and that of verses 6-15 in iii. 21-iv. 2. The latter part of iv. 2 is, however, an exilic or post-exilic addition. It should be followed immediately by iii. 16-18.

It may be worth while to remark that, as the text stands, all three sections of Jer. xxxiii. 14-26 (*sc.* verses 14-16, 17-22, 23-26) contain explicit promises to the seed of David, but no such reference occurs, where we might expect to find it, in xxx. 21, or in xxxi. 35-37.

The consideration of these Davidic prophecies suggests a fresh examination of those in the books of Amos and Hosea. I confess it

is surprising to me that any one should assign to the age of Amos the passage which forms an appendix rather than a conclusion to the book bearing his name. What connection, other than complete contrast, is there between these promises of restoration and the threats of searching judgment which precede them? In what sense could the tabernacle of David be regarded as fallen while his descendants still reigned over Judah? If verses 13, 14 were found in any part of Isaiah, who would hesitate to ascribe them to the "Great Unknown"? If now we note the formulæ which introduce verses 11 and 13, and which so often serve to attach exilic or post-exilic additions to the text of Isaiah and Jeremiah respectively, and if we also observe the imitation of Jeremiah in verse 15, we must, I think, admit that the ascription of these verses to Amos is quite unjustifiable.

One object of such additions was clearly to counterbalance the terrible predictions to which they were appended, and perhaps to avert or limit their fulfilment. The latter part of Hosea i. 10 (Ch. ii. 1 in Heb.), and also chap. ii. 1 (Eng.) are probably deprecatory glosses of this kind. If with these two omissions we transfer this passage to the end of chap. iii., the conclusion of what has been called the first book of Hosea will stand as follows:—

"For the children of Israel shall abide many days without king, and without prince, and without sacrifice, and without pillar, and without ephod or teraphim [afterward shall the children of Israel return, and seek Yahveh their God, and David their king; and shall come with fear unto Yahveh and to his goodness in the latter days. And it shall come to pass that the number of the children of Israel shall be as the sand of the sea, which cannot be measured nor numbered. And the children of Judah and the children of Israel shall be gathered together, and they shall appoint themselves one head, and shall go up from the land], for great shall be the day of Jezreel."

The whole passage which I have enclosed in brackets is, I believe, an interpolation belonging to the age of the Return. Note the oft-repeated promise of an increase in numbers, so needful to the restored community. And compare i. 11 (Eng.) with Jer. iii. 18, and l. 4. The last clause of this verse is genuine, and involves a reference to i. 5. In that which immediately precedes it, I am compelled to think, against my instructor, that "the land of captivity (as Kimchi, following the Targum) is intended."

The book of Micah will require separate treatment.

GREY HUBERT SKIPWITH.